DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	17-EBP-01
Project Title:	Improving Energy Compliance of Central Air-Conditioning and Heat Pump Systems
TN #:	224299
Document Title:	Stone Energy Associates Comments One good idea
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Stone Energy Associates/Nehemiah Stone
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	7/25/2018 3:46:46 PM
Docketed Date:	7/25/2018

Comment Received From: Nehemiah Stone

Submitted On: 7/25/2018 Docket Number: 17-EBP-01

## One good idea

Additional submitted attachment is included below.



Comments on improving Compliance with HVAC Changeouts July 25, 2018

Dear Judy and Lea,

I was not able to attend the June 29th workshop, but I read through the entire transcript I kept looking for **new** nuggets.

As background, I led the Compliance Improvement Advisory Committee under contract with PG&E. At that time, I was part of a team that wrote a paper on this very subject. I interviewed installers and distributors. Others on the writing committee interviewed other market actors (including Mr. Mahoney). With the exception of one suggestion in the June 29th transcript, all the other ideas had been discussed at that time.

I had also been a part of the WHPA with Kristin, Barbara, and Bob. Again, other than that one idea, nothing surfaced on June 29th that had not been discussed at length at WHPA.

Furthermore, the topic of HVAC change-out compliance is not new to the CEC either. We discussed it ad nauseum when I was staff at the Commission two decades ago. A lot, but not all, of the ideas from June 29<sup>th</sup> were on the table even back then.

The one idea that I read in the transcript that I had not heard before, was one that Scott Blunk raised about the City of Davis. He said that when he had been a contractor, every homeowner he dealt with in Davis wanted to make sure he pulled a permit. ... and none of the homeowners he dealt with elsewhere wanted him to. The difference being that Davis requires a Building Department inspection at time of sale and imparts penalties for work that has been done w/o a permit. Scott's experience, though anecdotal, is pretty good evidence that that strategy will work.

I have long been a proponent of the serial number tracking system, but am no longer quite as confident. One thing I have learned over the years is that as soon as you make something foolproof, along comes a better fool. IOW, if the contractors incentives to cheat (needing to choose between putting food on the table or getting a permit) remain the same, crafty distributors, contractors, and unlicensed installers will find a way around the tracking system's safeguards. As a few presenters said, the only real way to effect the change you want is to change the buyers' (homeowners') incentives and calculations. As a fee for a BD inspection on top of the other closing costs, \$200-\$400 to the BD for the Davis-style inspection would be inconsequential and generate little resistance (note exception below). On the other hand, having a sale delayed or having to have an engineer validate proper installation after the fact because no permit was pulled at the time, is a bigger deal.

The only real barrier I see to making the City of Davis strategy work statewide is the California Association of Realtors (CAR). When, as a contract consultant, I was helping the CEC discover and

> Nehemiah Stone 916 633-1225 nehemiah@



P.O. Box 324 Loomis, CA 95650

www.StoneEnergyAssc.com



understand barriers to increased uptake of efficiency upgrades in the existing home market (AB758 work), one idea floated was requiring an *energy efficiency opportunities audit* at time of sale. CAR came unglued and utilized their considerable sway with the Legislature to completely quash that idea. I suspect they would apply equal pressure against implementing Davis' solution to this problem, so you'd have to be prepared for that fight.

Sincerely,

Nehemiah Stone

Nehemiah Stone **916 633-1225** 

nehemiah@ StoneEnergyAssc.com



P.O. Box 324 Loomis, CA 95650

www.StoneEnergyAssc.com